



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LM
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,948	08/03/2001	Michael Violette	303.017US4	1213

21186 7590 02/25/2004

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

FARAHANI, DANA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2814

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/921,948

Applicant(s)

VIOLETTE, MICHAEL

Examiner

Dana Farahani

Art Unit

2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grubisich et al., hereinafter Grubisich (U.S. Patent 5,581,115), previously cited.

Grubisich discloses in figure 5a a transistor with emitter, base, and collector regions; 70, 76, and 86, respectively; and an intermediate region of the base and collector (region 88) having a surface area greater than that of the emitter and less than that of the base.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 10-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Grubisich.

Regarding claims 10, 13, 16-20, 23, 25-30, and 32-37, Grubisich discloses in figure 5a a transistor formed in a semiconductor substrate 60, the transistor comprising a collector region, 62, having an impurity therein, extending downward from the surface of the substrate; a base region 76 having an impurity therein and extending downward from the surface of the substrate

into contact with a portion of the collector; an emitter 70 on top of the base region with smaller area than the base region; a second implant, the region, that is the middle portion of the plug which is shown as region 90, in the collector region, about the same level from the surface of the substrate as the first implant; and an implant area 88 of the collector region, vertically adjacent to the base region, the implant area having an effective surface area greater than the surface area of the emitter and less than the surface area of the base region. Although, Grubisich does not expressly disclose the top surface area of region 88 is greater than that of the emitter, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the top surface area of the region 88, since such a modification would have involved a change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 21, 22, and 31, see Grubisich, column 12, lines 31-34, wherein it is stated that boron and phosphorus are used to make the regions of the device.

Regarding claim 24, the second implant (the middle portion of plug 90) has a surface area greater than the surface area of the opening at the top of it.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 11/13/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that means for minimizing carrier injection from the periphery of the emitter region to the collector region cannot be found in Grubisch. However, note that region 88

of figure 5a in the reference minimizes carrier injection from the periphery of the emitter region to the collector region.

Applicant further argues that the implant region, as stated in claims 39 and 41, has a surface area greater than that of the emitter, while in the reference this is not the case. However, note that region 88 in figure 5A, has a larger vertical width than that of the emitter, although, they appear to have the same length. Therefore, implant region has a greater area than that of the emitter, and clearly smaller than that of the base, as can be seen in the figure.

Regarding applicant's argument that making the top surface area of the emitter smaller than that of the region 88 is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, note that adjusting the emitter surface of a bipolar transistor is well known in the art. A reference, Sovero (US Patent 5,378,922) is presented for applicant's review (see column 1, lines 15-27).

Product-by-Process Limitations

While not objectionable, the Office reminds Applicant that "product by process" limitations in claims drawn to structure are directed to the product, per se, no matter how actually made. *In re Hirao*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also, *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685; *In re Luck*, 177 USPQ 523; *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324; *In re Avery*, 186 USPQ 161; *In re Wethheim*, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); *In re Marosi et al.*, 218 USPQ 289; and particularly *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or

Art Unit: 2814

otherwise. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear. Thus, no patentable weight will be given to those process steps which do not add structural limitations to the final product.

For example, in claims 36 and 37, the implant regions being simultaneously formed by an angled implant, or by the same source, are considered methods of forming those regions and not limitations of the final product. Therefore, such limitations are given no patentable weight.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dana Farahani whose telephone number is (571)272-1706. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM - 6:00PM.

Art Unit: 2814

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael M Fahmy can be reached on (571)272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dana Farahani

SU:

EXAMINER
CENTER 2800